



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,170	06/29/2000	Tanmoy Dutta	MSFT-0178/150708.1	7941

7590 08/04/2004
John E McGlynn
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz MacKiewicz & Norris LLP
46th Floor
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/607,170

Applicant(s)

DUTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 25-30 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

2. Newly submitted claims 25-30 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The newly added claims contain new issues such as maintaining a first list of users and a second list of operations and accessing both lists classified in database. These newly added claims regarding an invention distinct from the original presented claims raise new issue and require a different class search since such issues are classes in a different class.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 25-30 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The following terms renders the claims indefinite:

Art Unit: 2154

- i. change in the state occupied by the working copy of the document
in the workflow (the claim language shows ambiguity regarding
the state occupied by the working copy of the document).

b. The following terms lack proper antecedence basis:

- i. Claim 21, "the state".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverstock et al (Haverstock), US 2002/0038357, in view of Serbinis et al (Serbinis), US 6,314,425.

7. Haverstock was cited in the last office action.

8. As per claims 1 and 12, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented method for controlling access to documents during a workflow (pp. 0009, 0012, 0027), comprising:

Art Unit: 2154

- a. upon entry of a base document into a workflow (document, pp. 0027-0028);
- b. selectively providing a user access to the base document (document, pp. 0027-0028) depending upon the identity of a user (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0046, 0057, 0060, 0062-0071);
- c. selectively providing access to perform operations on the base document depending upon the identity of a user (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0059-0060, 0066-0071).

9. Haverstock further taught that access privilege is different for different user identities (pp. 0060, 0065-0071) and to provide accesses to perform operations on the accessed document of such user identity (pp. 0065-0071). Haverstock did not specifically teach to create a working copy of the base document, selectively provide a user access to the working copy of the base document and selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user. Serbinis taught to make a copy of the base document and to enable user access to the working copy of the base document depending on the user authorization (col.11, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock and Serbinis because Serbinis's teaching of making a copy of the base document and

Art Unit: 2154

accessing the copy of base document enables Haverstock's system to leave the base document available for access by other authorized users (Serbinis, col.11, lines 7-16).

10. As per claim 2, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Haverstock further taught the method to further comprising:

- a. storing access control list data in relation to the base document, the access control list data defining access controls on performing operations of the working copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0071); and
- b. storing security descriptor data in relation to the base document and the working copy of the base document, the security descriptor data defining access controls on reading the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0066, 0069).

11. As per claims 3-4, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Haverstock further taught that wherein the step of selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0065-0066), comprises:

- a. determining using the access control list data stored in relation to the base document that a user has/does not have permission to perform an operation on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0063, 0065-0066, 0070-0071); and
- b. allowing/denying the user to perform the operation on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0066-0067).

12. As per claims 5-6, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control list data comprises information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation, and said act of selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0060-0071), comprises:

- a. referencing the information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation (pp. 0062-0063, 0067-0071); and
- b. if the user is/is not in the set of users that have permission to perform the operation, providing/denying access to the operation (pp. 0057).

13. As per claim 7, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 5. Haverstock further taught that wherein the set of users are defined in terms of the roles that have permission to perform the operation (pp. 0057-0058, 0060, 0065-0066), and said act of referencing the information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation (pp. 0065-0071), comprises:

- a. resolving for the user the set of roles to which the user has been assigned (pp. 0057-0058); and
- b. determining using the set of roles to which the user has been assigned and the set of users defined in terms of the roles that have permission to

perform the operation, whether the user has permission to perform the requested operation (pp. 0065-0071).

14. As per claims 8-9, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2 including the step of selectively providing a user access to the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0065-0066, see claims 1-2 rejection), Haverstock further taught the step to comprise:

- a. determining using the security descriptor data stored in relation to the base document and the working copy document, that a user has/does not have permission to read the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0063, 0065-0066, 0070-0071); and
- b. providing/denying the user access to the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057).

15. As per claim 10, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Haverstock further taught wherein the security descriptor data comprises information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0066), and said act of selectively providing access to the working copy of the base documents depending on the identity of the user (pp. 0065-0071), comprises:

- a. referencing the information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0069-0071); and

Art Unit: 2154

- b. if the user is in the set of users that have permission to read the working copy of the base document, providing access to the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0069).

16. As per claim 11, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10. Haverstock further taught wherein the set of users are defined in terms of the roles that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document, and said act of referencing the information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0065-0071), comprises:

- a. resolving for the user the set of roles to which the user has been assigned (pp. 0057); and
- b. determining using the set of roles to which the user has been assigned and the set of roles that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document, whether the user has permission to read the base document or the working copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0071).

17. As per claim 13, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed including a system for providing document isolation in a workflow environment (pp. 0009, 0012, 0027-0028), comprising:

- a. a processor, wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following acts (pp. 0011):

Art Unit: 2154

- i. maintaining for a base document undergoing a publishing workflow (0027-0028), the base document (pp. 0018, replication, pp. 0025);
- ii. maintaining access control data in relation to the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0066);
- iii. upon receipt of a request to access the base document (pp. 0027-0028), selectively determining based on the access control data to provide access to the base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0065-0071).

18. Haverstock further taught to maintain access control data in relation to the documents (pp. 0063, 0065-0066). Haverstock did not specifically teach to maintain a copy of the base document and to selectively determine based on the access control data, to provide access to the copy of the base document. Serbinis taught to make a copy of the base document and to grant user access to the working copy of the base document depending on the user authorization (col.11, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock and Serbinis because Serbinis's teaching of making a copy of the base document and accessing the copy of base document enables Haverstock's system to leave the base document available for access by other authorized users (Serbinis, col.11, lines 7-16).

Art Unit: 2154

19. As per claim 14, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control data comprises security descriptor data identifying the set of users that have permission to read the base document and the copy of the base document (pp. 0057-0058, 0062-0063, 0065-0071).

20. As per claim 15, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 14. Haverstock further taught wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following acts:

- a. referencing the security descriptor data (pp. 0067-0071); and
- b. determining that a user should be directed to the copy of the base document based on the security descriptor data (pp. 0057, 0060, 0066-0071).

21. As per claim 16, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 15. Haverstock further taught wherein the security descriptor data identifies a set of roles corresponding to the set of users that have permission to read the base document and the copy of the base document, and wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the act of determining the set of roles that a user has been assigned (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

22. As per claim 17, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control data comprises

Art Unit: 2154

access control list data identifying the set of users that have permission to perform operations on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0065-0071).

23. As per claim 18, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 17. Haverstock further taught wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following acts:

- a. referencing the access control list data (pp. 0067-0071).; and
- b. determining that a user should be allowed to perform an operation on the copy of the base document based on the access control list data (pp. 0057, 0060, 0066-0071).

24. As per claim 19, Haverstock and Serbinis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 18. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control list data identifies a set of roles corresponding to the set of users that have permission to perform operations on the copy of the base document, and wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the further act of determining the set of roles that a user has been assigned (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

25. Claims 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverstock, US 2002/0038357, in view of Serbinis, US 6,314,425, and Sudama et al (Sudama), US 5,555,375.

26. Haverstock and Sudama were cited in the last office action.

Art Unit: 2154

27. As per claim 20, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method for controlling access to operations that may be performed on a document (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071), comprising:

- a. Workflow processes (pp. 0027-0028)
- b. Receiving a request to create a new operation that may be performed on the documents (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, access privilege changed, 0065-0071);
- c. Updating the access control list to include entries (pp. 0060-0066).

28. Haverstock further taught to update access controls to reflect the addition of a new operation (pp. 0060, access privilege changed) that may be performed on documents (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

29. Haverstock did not specifically teach the method to comprise: creating a copy of the base document, assigning a unique identifier to the new operation; updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation nor to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. Serbinis taught to make a copy of the base document and to grant user access to the working copy of the base document depending on the user authorization upon creation of a workflow (col.11, lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock and Serbinis

Art Unit: 2154

because Serbinis's teaching of making a copy of the base document and accessing the copy of base document enables Haverstock's system to leave the base document available for access by other authorized users (Serbinis, col.11, lines 7-16).

30. Haverstock and Serbinis did not specifically teach the method to comprise: assigning a unique identifier to the new operation; updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation nor to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. Sudama taught to assign unique identifier to operations (col.5, lines 33-37, col.8, lines 55-57) for management purpose. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama because Sudama's teaching of assigning unique identifiers to operations to provide management benefits enables Haverstock and Serbinis' method to manage and keep track of the types of operations performed on the documents using the identifiers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also provide unique identification to new operations in Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama's system in order to manage the new operations performed on the documents.

31. Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama did not specifically teach the method to comprise updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation or to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. However, in order to add the new operation and enable the roles to have access to the new operation, the access control list must be updated so the authentication

Art Unit: 2154

to the existing users is valid with the new operation since the access control list is in correspondence with the operations and user roles. It is an essential step to include entries of such new operations and roles with authorities to such new operations to be entered into the control access list, whether the step is done manually or automatically, that cannot be skipped. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that once a new operation is introduced in Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama's method, the access control list must be edited to provide up to date authentication to provide existing users, that have the privilege, to execute the new operation.

32. As per claim 22, Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 20. Haverstock further taught wherein the workflow is a publishing workflow and the new operation is at least one of the following: review and approve (pp. 0027-0028).

33. As per claim 23, Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 20. Haverstock further comprising:

- a. Receiving a request to perform the new operation on the copy of the base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071);
- b. Determining using the access control list whether to allow access to the new operation (pp. 0057-0058, 0062-0063).

Art Unit: 2154

34. As per claim 24, Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23. Haverstock further taught wherein determining using the access control list whether to allow access to the new operation comprises comparing a user's roles with the roles identified in the access control list as having access to the new operation (pp. 0057-0058, 0062-0063).

35. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Barkley, US 6,088,679.

36. Barkley was cited in the last office action.

37. As per claim 21, Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 20. Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama did not specifically teach to update the access control list to change roles that have access to the new operation in response to a change in the state occupied by the working copy of the document in the workflow. Barkley taught to update the access control list to change roles that have access to the new operation in response to a change in the state occupied by the working copy of the document in the workflow (col.6, lines 23-27, 34-39, 42-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock, Serbinis, Sudama and Barkley because Barkley's teaching of changing roles in response to a change in the state of the

Art Unit: 2154

workflow help Haverstock, Serbinis and Sudama's system to create unique role for each activity in the workflow (col.6, lines 44-47, 64-65).

Response to Arguments

38. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

39. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Brown et al, US 6,067,551.

Nochur et al, US 5,835,758.

Antognini et al, US 5,649,185.

40. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.


Art Unit: 2154

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
July 29, 2004


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100